A U M

Without a moment's loss through dreams, or the sound of worldly opinions, or forgetfulness, seek the real Self within thyself. —*Crest Jewel of Wisdom*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXV September, 1947 No. 11

THE FREEDOM OF INDIA

THE Theosophical Movement in the time of H. P. Blavatsky had three foci: America, India and England. In America, the Theosophical Society was inaugurated; in India, the first magazine—*The Theosophist*—was established and the Headquarters settled; to England Mme. Blavatsky went in the last years of her life, publishing there *The Secret Doctrine,* and her later books, and founding the magazine *Lucifer.* The Theosophical Movement not being dependent upon politics, its work could be undertaken simultaneously in three such dissimilar political situations: a rising democracy, an exploited dominion, and the capital of an empire. The Theosophical Movement being without political aims, its effect was not looked for in the realm of political and social reform. But since *all* the factors bearing on the promulgation of Theosophy are taken into account by Theosophical Agents, it naturally befell that these factors—including political and social conditions—were occasionally discussed for their theosophical implications. Viewed in the light of the First Object, for instance, America's exaggerated "independence," was as much an obstacle as England's excessive class consciousness, and the passivity of the Indian people as much to be regretted as its opposite—the hyper-tension of American life.

The theosophist does not labor primarily for the glory of "his own" country. Studying the law of karma, and the cyclic rise and fall of nations, one may outgrow the standard of a narrow nationalism and come to appraise human history from another vantage-point. From prosperity wantonly used in *any* nation, privation is to be expected; in dark reverses patiently borne, can be discerned the

seed of new birth. The law of reincarnation as applied to nations and races brings conviction that "civilization is an inheritance, a patrimony that passes from race to race along the ascending and descending paths of cycles."

In the seventy-odd years since the beginning of the present Theosophical Movement, the karma of nations has become extremely explosive, and the status of the United States, England and India considerably altered. But not the most violent or apparently sudden catastrophe to civilization need have come as a surprise to the student of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge. In 1888, in the *Secret Doctrine,* it was written that England was "on the eve" of a certain disaster, and Europe in general threatened with a cataclysm "which her own cycle of racial *Karma has led her* to." In 1886, readers of Mr. Judge's *Path* Magazine were introduced to the prophecy that "This glorious country [America], free as it is, will not long be calm; *unrest is the word for this cycle.*" For India, the prognostication was of a parallel unlikelihood, but has proved of equal veracity. In a letter to A. P. Sinnett in 1887, H.P.B. quoted one of her Adept teachers as saying that the hour for the retirement of the English from India would not strike "*till next century*—and that 'late enough to see even Dennie an old, old man'." Dennie, Mr. Sinnett's son, was then a boy, and would have been seventy years old on August 15, 1947, the date of the British withdrawal.

The freedom of India is of more than political interest to the theosophist. India was the home of the first sub-race of the fifth Root Race, and the most perverse political fortunes have never completely dimmed the splendor of her philosophical treasures. It is evident that in preserving the teachings imparted to Fifth-Race mankind, India preserved also an integrity which insured her spiritual renascence. Reverence for wisdom and its teachers did not leave the soul of India, and just as the Himalayas offered a secure retreat for the "Dwellers on High Mountains," so the Indian national character permitted—when the cycle turned—the incarnation of the great patriot souls who have been the means of energizing its people and opening the new day of its future.

"Freedom for India" is a social ideal toward which a major political step has just been taken. The freedom *of* India is a matter of philosophical attitude, and in insisting upon this truth India's leaders

have been less hampered by materialism than would the same leaders if born to the West. Popular censure and distrust has not been hurled at Gandhi and Nehru when their statements reflect some philosophy of statesmanship: Gandhi's self-denial and self-control represent a conquest of bitterness that is outstanding even in the Orient; and Nehru's writings show that he brings to the struggles of the moment the balance of an assimilated past. These are vital factors, which, despite India's present turbulence and inevitable political mistakes, may continue to work toward a true psychological and mental freedom.

The individual theosophist, pressed by the obscurities of his karma, has profited by the advice, "keep in line with the Work, and the Work will keep you in line." Nations and races, checked by their karma, merit similar protection by keeping faith with the original ideals of their pioneers. Of this law, among the nations, India is the greatest exemplar.

"The Waiting Structure"

The fact is significant that the Theosophical movement was begun in the Western world, in the country where the preparations for the new root race are going on, and where that new root is to appear. This was not to give precedence to any one race or country over another, or to reduce any race or country, but was and is according to the law of cycles, which is a part of evolution. In the eye of that great Law no country is first or last, new or old, high or low, but each at the right time is appropriate for whatever the work is that must be performed. Each country is bound up with all the others and must assist them.

This movement has, among others, an object which should be borne in mind. It is the union of the West with the East. For many centuries this union has been worked towards and workers have been sent out through the West to lay the foundations. But not until 1875 could a wide public effort be made, and then the Theosophical Society came into existence because the times were ripe and the workers ready.

We have to educate the West so that it may appreciate the possibilities of the East, and thus on the waiting structure in the East may be built up a new order of things for the benefit of all. —W.Q.J.

DAILY PSYCHOLOGY

"The Self is the Friend of Self and also Its Enemy."

THIS sentence in the *Bhagavad Gita* has been often passed over as being either meaningless or mysterious; on one hand worthless to consider, and on the other hand impossible. Some students have, however, made good use of the teaching contained in it. It is a verse that bears directly upon Theosophy as applied to our daily life, and therefore may well be scrutinized.

It indicates two selves, one the enemy and also the friend of the other. Evidently, without the suggestions found in Theosophy, two selves in one person cannot seem otherwise than meaningless, except in those cases, admitted by Science, where there is an aberration of the intellect, where one lobe of the brain refuses to work with the other, or where there is some cerebral derangement. But after a little study of the constitution of man—material and spiritual—as we find it outlined in the Wisdom-Religion, we easily see that the higher and the lower self are meant.

The next injunction, to "raise the self by the self," clearly points to this; for, as a thing cannot raise itself without a fulcrum, the self which will raise us must be the higher one, and that which is to be raised is the lower.

In order to accomplish this task we must gain an acquaintance with the self which is to be raised. The greater and more accurate that acquaintance is, the quicker will proceed the work of elevating the being who attempts it.

Let us for a moment look at the obstacles in the way, the reasons why, with so many, their understanding of themselves is so plainly deficient.

Everyone knows that he can see the defects in the actions and character of other men better than his own. Some, of course, there are who do not allow that they have defects.

St. James says that a man looketh in a glass and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he is. While I have often doubt-

---

NOTE.—This paper by Mr. Judge was read before the Aryan T.S., June 6, 1890, and appeared in August, 1890, as No. 5 of the Branch Papers issued by the American Section. The title used is our own.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

ed this, yet it is true in respect to that looking-glass which is often held up to us by others to see ourselves in. We see for a moment our appearance, and then forget it.

There are some things, however, as to which it is often impossible for us to know ourselves. Such of our tones as are harsh or disagreeable we often cannot hear as others do. For there is hardly anything so difficult as to really hear our own voice in its entirety of tone and accent. We are so accustomed to it that we cannot tell whether it be pleasing or repellent, musical or discordant. We have to rely upon the statements of those who hear it. Indeed, I doubt seriously if anyone can ever fully hear, in the way those to whom we speak do, the tones of his voice, because it is conveyed to us not only through the medium of the outer ear which receives the vibrations made without us, but we receive it in addition through the vibrations made within all through the skull, and hence it must ever be a different voice for ourselves. So it would not be profitable to pay too much attention to the sound of our voice if we do so to the exclusion of that inner attitude which nearly always determines the tone in which we speak; for if our feelings be kind and charitable, it is more than likely that the vocal expression of them will correspond. The cultivation of the voice, so far as it is possible, can safely be left to those teachers who aim to soften and polish it.

By taking a few examples from among the many about us and assuming that they represent possible defects and peculiarities of our own, we may arrive at something useful in our Theosophic life.

Here is one who will constantly tell you that several others are always very fond of talking of themselves and their affairs, and appear to take no interest in the conversation unless it has themselves for center. And after thus depicting the failing of the others, this person—man or woman—immediately proceeds to show that that is his own particular fault, for from that moment the burden of the conversation is "I" or "my" affairs.

Our next subject is one who talks a great deal about altruism and brotherhood, but would not give a dollar to any good cause. Not perhaps from intentional niggardliness, but from sheer habit of not giving and not helping.

Here is another who exemplifies the prominent defect of the century, inattention. He listens to you, but only hears a part, and then, when repeating what he says he heard you say, he gives a version entirely at variance with yours. Or, listening to an argument or discussion, he only attends to that part which being familiar to him strikes him favorably.

Next we have the bigot who, while exalting freedom of thought and the unity of all men, displays most frightful bigotry.

Then there is another who illustrates a variety of the first to which I referred—the man who wishes apparently only to impose his own views upon you, and is careless about knowing what your opinions may be.

Here is the partisan who favors such a school or sect. Nothing can be said against them, no defect may be pointed out. Partisanship clouds it all.

Now all these are merely samples, but in some degree every one of us has them all—perhaps slightly, but still there. They are all the result of the predominance of the lower self, for they all show a disposition to put the personal *I* to the front. They are the present triumph of the lower self over the efforts of the higher. They may be abated in some degree by attention to their outer expression, but no real progress will be gained unless work upon the hidden plane is begun. Such a defect as that one of not listening long to another man's views, but hurrying to tell him what you think yourself, is one that affects the acquiring of new ideas. If you constantly tell others what you think, you are gaining nothing. For your experience and views are your own, well known to you. The repeated expression of them only serves to imprint them more strongly on your mind. You do not receive any of the new lights that other minds might cast upon your philosophy if you gave them the opportunity.

There are other factors in our constitution which are powerful for the production of faults. Every man has two lines of descent. One is that which comes through his parents and has to do with his mental and physical make-up. This line may run back into the most strange and peculiar places, and be found winding in and out among manners and minds not suspected by us. Suppose your physical line of descent comes through Danes or Norwegians and mine through the French. There will be to some extent a want of

sympathy and appreciation on the mental plane between us. Of course this effect will not be apparent if the period of time is long since our blood ran in those bodies, but still there will be left some trace of it. There will be a tendency always for the physical, including the brain, to show the characteristics which result from the preponderance of inherited faculties and dispositions. These characteristics belong wholly to the physical plane, and are carried down from the centuries past by inheritance, affecting the particular body you may inhabit in any one incarnation. It is your Karma to have that sort of physical environment about your inner self.

Now the obstacles to the perception of truth and to the acquirement of knowledge of self which are in consequence of the physical inheritance, are difficult to perceive, involving much study and self-examination for bringing them to light. But they are there, and the serious Theosophist will search for them. These differences in the physical body, which we will call for the time differences in inheritance, are of the highest importance. They resemble the difference between telescopes or microscopes made by different opticians, and tend to cause us to see truth clearly or blurred, or surrounded by many-colored mists. What we most desire to have is a mental telescope that is not only powerful, but also devoid of the colors which achromatic quality only will dispel.

The second line of descent is that one which belongs purely to the inner man; that is, the psychical line. It is obscure, and, indeed, can only be discovered and defined by an adept or a trained seer whose clairvoyance permits him to see that intangible yet powerful thread which has so much to do with our character. It is just as important as the physical descent, in fact more so, because it has to do with the ever-living man, whereas the physical tenement is selected by or follows upon the actions which the inner man compelled the former body to perform. So it may be altered at any time with ease if we live in obedience to the higher law.

Passing from the broad line of descent in a nation, we find each individual governed also by the family peculiarities and faults, and they are not so easy to define as those that are national, since few men are in possession of any facts sufficient to ascertain the general family tendencies.

Coming down now to ourselves, it is almost axiomatic that each one's mind acts in a way *peculiar to itself*. There is a tendency that daily grows stronger, after our earlier years, for the mind to get into a rut, its own rut or mode of looking at things and ideas. This is of great importance. For the man who has freed his mind so that it is capable of easily entering into the methods of other minds is more likely to see truth quicker than he who is fixed in his own ways.

We must then at once constitute ourselves our own critics and adversaries, for it is not often that anyone else is either willing or capable to take that part for us.

Our first step and the most difficult—for some, indeed, impossible—is to shock ourselves in such a manner that we may quickly be able to get out of, or rather understand, our own mental methods. I do not mean that we must abandon all our previous training and education, but that we shall so analyze all our mental operations as to know with certainty, to easily perceive, the actual difference in method between ourselves and any other person. This is a thing seldom undertaken or accomplished by men nowadays. Each one is enamored of his own mental habits, and disinclined to admit that any other one can be better. When we have become acquainted with this mental path of ours, we are then in position to see whether in any particular case our view is false.

This is the psychological and metaphysical equivalent of that scientific process which classifies and compares so as to arrive at distinguishing differences in things in order that physical laws may be discovered. For while we remain in ignorance of the method and path of our mind's action, there is no way in which we can compare with other minds. We can compare views and opinions, but not the actual mechanics of the thought. We can hear doctrines, but are unable to say whether we accept or reject from right reasoning or because our peculiar slant on the mental plane compels us to ratiocinate wholly in accordance with a mental obliquity acquired by many years of hurried life.

The value of thus understanding our own mental bias so that we can give it up at will and enter into the bias of another's mind is seen when we consider that each of us is able to perceive but one

of the many sides which truth presents. If we remain in the rut which is natural, we pass through an entire life viewing nature and the field of thought through but one sort of instrument. But by the other practice we may obtain as many different views of truth as the number of the minds we meet. When another human being brings his thoughts before us, we may not only examine them in our way, but also take his method and, adopting his bias for the time as our own, see just that much more.

It is very easy to illustrate this from ordinary life. The novelist sees in the drawing-rooms of society and the hovels of the poor only the material that may serve as the basis for a new book, while the social schemer drives thought of hovels away and sees in society only the means of gratifying pride and ambition, yet the artist can only think of the play of color and arrangement of figures, the harmony that delights his artistic sense.

The plain man of affairs is not attracted by the complex events of every day which have no relation to his business, whereas the student of Occultism knows that very obscure events point to other things yet in the future. In every stratum of society and every art or profession we constantly have it brought home to us that each man looks at any subject from but one or two standpoints, and when a well-balanced mind is found looking at events and men and thoughts freely from all sides, everyone sees at once a superiority in the person, albeit they may not be able to explain it.

But it is in Theosophic study especially that it is wise for us to constitute ourselves our own critics and to adopt as far as possible the practice of leaving our own mental road and taking up some other. The truth is simple and not so difficult to arrive at if we will follow the advice of the Hindu *Upanishad* and cut away error. Error grows largely out of notions and preconceptions educated into us by our teachers and our lives.

The influence of these preconceptions is seen every day among those Theosophists who are seeking for more books to read upon Theosophy. Their minds are so full of old notions which are not violently expelled, that truth cannot be easily perceived. But if they read fewer new books and spent more time in re-reading those first attempted, meanwhile studiously endeavoring to enter into all of the author's thought, much more progress would be gained.

Take, for instance, the *Key to Theosophy.* It is full of all the main doctrines of the Wisdom-Religion, and of hints towards others. Many persons have read the book and then sought another. They say that they have mastered it. Yet if you put to them some questions or listen to their own, it is apparent that only that part of the work which in some way coincides with their own previous training and line of thought has been grasped. Now this is just the part they need not have dwelt upon, because, being like to themselves, it may at any time be understood. But if one will ever stand as one's own critic, then those parts which seem obscure will be attacked, and, being viewed from all sides, may be soon turned into a possession. And just because such has not been the practice, it has come to be the fact that some extremely valuable presentations of doctrine and philosophy remain buried in earlier Theosophical books and magazines, while those who once read them have gone feverishly on to other works and forgotten that which might have enlightened them.

The Theosophist who delights to call himself practical and logical, an abhorrer of mysticism, should try to see what the mystical Theosophist means, and the mystic one should read carefully the words of the practical member to the end that he may counterbalance himself. A wholly practical or entirely mystical mind is not well balanced. And as long as the logical and practical man in our ranks scouts mysticism and never reads it, so long will he remain deformed and unbalanced in the eyes of those who see both sides, because he is wrapped up in ideas and methods that are only right in their own domain. The attitude of mind proposed is not to be observed only toward our literature and the philosophy studied; it is to be that of every hour and applicable to our dealings with our fellowmen. It will lead us to discern the common failing of refusing to consider the thoughts expressed by another because his or her personality is disagreeable to us. Often in our ranks we can find those who never pay any attention to certain other members who they have decided cannot reason properly or talk clearly.

Now aside from all considerations of charity and politeness, there is an occult law much lost sight of, and that is that everyone is led insensibly by Karmic law to address others on these topics and to afford an opportunity to the person addressed of taking a

leap, so to say, out of his own favorite way, and considering life as seen through the eyes of another. This is often brought about, if we permit it, through the endeavor to control the irritation or dullness caused by the way in which the other person presents the thought in his mind. But if we refuse to use the opportunity, either by absolutely running away or by covering our minds with a hard coat of indifference, the new and bright idea just trembling into the field of our consciousness is thrown back and lost in the dark recesses of the mental plane. Or, taking another view, we may under Karmic law be the one and only person just then fitted to elucidate our brother's idea, and we remain still the debtor to him if we do not accept the opportunity. On either hand the result is demerit.

Let us, then, conquer self in the field indicated, and thus turn the inward insidious enemy and deceiver into the friend and constant guide.

Necessary Experience

Things past are always easier than things present or things yet to come. The past can be judged by relative importance; it is the hollow of the wave of our progress, whereas the present and the future represent the crest and the resistance felt or feared. Yet if we remember—the past, when it was both present and future, held such disturbances, which we now see were a waste of energy. We should learn from this to "resist without resistance"; that too great an expenditure of thought, of energy is not wise. When we fight we are drawn into the swirl of events and passions; so it is best to lean back on the Self, which is never moved, and look on at the flotsam and jetsam through which "we" move. We can look at the very worst that may happen, in the same way as we now look back on what has been. I think that practically all that troubles us is unnecessary, as trouble, but necessary *for experience.* —R.C.

STUDIES IN KARMA

III: Transition and Travail

KALI YUGA, the Iron Age, "black with horrors," is *black* because it witnesses the deepest descent of man into matter; it is *iron* because that metal and concentration upon its uses symbolize neglect of the needs of the spiritual nature and of moral evolution. Emergence from Kali Yuga will be attained only by a further incarnation of Manas, by the transition from "man possessed of the germ of mind to the man of mind complete"—by the building of a bridge between the world of matter and the world of moral responsibility.

In Kali Yuga, the world of matter, moved by desire, whirls ever faster, enmeshing "the sodden self" in the intricacies of compounded collective Karma. And the world of matter, thus impelled, moves to its own destruction, with the Atom bomb as an appropriate symbol of its Armageddon.

The inertia of moral irresponsibility in the West manifested itself, first, in the adoption by the Western World of the Personal God of loves, hates, and inexplicable interventions, with man as a puppet. Contrast with this the philosophy of the third fundamental of *The Secret Doctrine:* "The pivotal doctrine of the Esoteric philosophy admits no privileges or special gifts in man save those won by his own Ego through *personal* effort and merit throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations." This is the fundamental doctrine of the responsibility of man as creator, while the law of compounded Karma is the doctrine of responsibility for all of his creations.

We are in the throes of an age wherein the individual has apparently been reduced to a cipher by the pressure of self-created circumstances. Men tend to move amorally as part of a vast pattern or process. How shall the tide be turned? In the "Summing Up" of *The Secret Doctrine,* H. P. Blavatsky gives indication that the only road back is that road which is travelled with an awakened sense of individual moral responsibility:

> The Universe is worked and *guided* from *within outwards.* As above so it is below, as in heaven so on earth; and man—the microcosm and miniature copy of the macrocosm—is the living

> witness to this Universal Law and to the mode of its action. We see that every *external* motion, act, gesture, whether voluntary or mechanical, organic or mental, is produced and preceded by internal feeling or emotion, will or volition, and thought or mind. As no outward motion or change, when normal, in man's external body can take place unless provoked by an inward impulse, given through one of the three functions named, so with the external or manifested Universe. (*S.D.* I, 274.)

Certain events of World War II need original study from the perspective of "Theosophical sociology." To say that this war "was no different from any other" is simply an anti-war slogan which has lost most of its meaning. But the purported crusade to oppose totalitarianism has apparently lost much of its meaning also.

The Nazi death camps descended to new depths of inhumanity. So, also, the slave-labor policies—the transplanting of great masses of people—first practiced by the Germans, and subsequently by the Russians upon the Germans; so, too, the atomic bomb and the circumstances of its use. All these horrors revolve around the problem of the individual, the unit who is engulfed by the modern State. If we consider these "inhumanities to man" consecutively, it is possible to discern the outline of a single Karmic cycle represented in them all.

The military machine of no modern nation allows the individual soldier to question or philosophize about the moral implications of the orders he is required to carry out. Only four of the crew that dropped the first atomic bomb knew anything whatever of the nature of their cargo. Is not the average man belonging to any military order in a similar predicament? Granted, that men conscripted by the United States were not asked to be paymasters in death camps—but if they had been? . . . The danger is always present as long as men conform submissively to patterns, for the man who controls the pattern *may* carry from step to step the tendency to regard human beings as means to the end of the State rather than as ends in themselves. And human evolution stops for the man who simply conforms to patterns to the degree that such compliance makes him *amoral.*

One of the interesting documents of the last war was an evaluation of "Military Society" by a man who served three years in the American Army, first published in the magazine *Politics,* Oct. 1945:

> Never before in history has man mobilized such huge armies as are contending in this war. Every color of skin in every color of uniform is marching today—recruited, trained, rationed, housed, and deployed by the various nations. To achieve the organization of these vast forces, great pyramidal structures, based on the authority principle and hierarchical in nature, have been created. There is an astonishing resemblance between them, whatever the differences in the civil societies that produced them. . . . The man who enters the armed services of his country becomes the "citizen" of a totalitarian society. This society is based upon absolute authority and backed up by threat of death in many forms. It is this salient fact which, it seems to me, has been neglected by almost all writers dealing with the subject at hand. . . . We are not yet aware of the implications of life under a highly-organized, all-pervading totalitarian society, which has now endured long enough to leave some permanent traces upon the individuals who have lived under it. The organization of the Army, for example, is perfectly pyramidal and more tightly knit by the hierarchic principle of rank than any civilian society of our day, including the most totalitarian.
>
> In a democratic society (and any civil society is democratic in comparison with any military society of our day), authority and responsibility operate in a complex, relatively humane fashion, determined at least theoretically by the citizen himself, his needs, and wishes. In the authoritarian society of the armed forces, however, responsibility can only be downward, toward the lower ranks; and authority lies in one direction: upward. The soldier, therefore, is the subject, not the object of his society.

This devaluation of the individual is characteristic of all modern "national" movements; it underlay the Nazi transplantation of Poles, Frenchmen, and other ethnic groups from their homes to areas where they could serve more efficiently the needs of the "total state." The Russian Government then imported many thousands of Germans showing the same type of unconcern in the breaking up of families formerly evidenced by the Nazis.

The militarists of every great power are today pressing for universal "peacetime" conscription. Another armaments race has thus already begun. And what guarantees are being given that these armaments are even *intended* to secure "the self-determination of nations"—or of individuals? The "Atlantic Charter" is finally revealed to have served little function other than idealistic publicity, never having even the dignity of a formal recording. The "free-

doms" supposedly guaranteed therein to *all* countries had been long denied to India, and this not simply through military occupation, but by such despotic means as the political imprisonments of Jawarharlal Nehru and Mohandas Gandhi. But a few years ago Nehru's sister, attending the highly publicized "International" San Francisco Conference of 1946, in an attempt to explain India's political plight, was unable to attract serious attention; at which time, incidentally, her brother was *still* in a British prison for peaceably advocating the four freedoms in his mother land. . . . This is not in special condemnation of British policy, but in condemnation of Western culture as basically conscienceless, operating politically at the level of the "law of self-preservation."

Warped and often abortive in effect, the revolutions of the eighteenth century were a struggle to break the chains of a social system which held the individual helpless. The concept of democracy, for which so many profess instinctive veneration, grew from the same tree, the roots of which thirstily seek the waters of new life for the individual. But where is new vitality for that tree now to be found? Its foliage is dying, while withered branches masquerade in pretense of a strength never existent except when nurtured by the freedom and strength of the individual human spirit.

New sustenance is to be found in a philosophy which enlightens the problem of "good" and "evil" by teaching the *evolution* of the dual nature of man—thus making the individual a "creature of promise" indeed—and by postulating man as a pilgrim whose opportunities to come to terms with himself and with all beings extend through the limitless vistas of countless incarnations on earth. "Help is to be found in these and in no other doctrines," and in the inspiration of the lives of the courageous few who instinctively embody these principles in action, who themselves refuse to perpetrate the amoral patterns of society, and who make their choice with a sense of individual moral responsibility.

The day of the death camps, of slave labor, of universal conscription, of the atom bomb, is a day of collective irresponsibility. Moral man must be rediscovered in the debris of an amoral society concerned chiefly with the mechanical preservation of institutions. The age of greatest physical destruction has been prepared by the

destruction of the idea of the importance of the individual soul. It is the obligation and trust of the Theosophical Movement to renew man's faith in man, by providing a metaphysical foundation for the "new order of ages"—the intellectual and moral courage which must attend the travail of its birth. When society tends to be amoral, the acts of the moral man who fights to establish *principles* of justice will often appear to be oppositional rather than directly constructive. This is one of the inversions of Kali Yuga, as well as a tragedy for the individuals who in one way or another "stand out" and are separate. Yet Theosophists already have a *constructive* plan for the spread of moral principles—a plan and a vehicle for education in *soul* responsibility.

"THE DOMINANT DRIFT"

Every despotism has a specially keen and hostile instinct for whatever keeps up human dignity, and independence. And it is curious to see scientific and realist teaching used everywhere as a means of stifling all freedom of investigation as addressed to moral questions under a dead weight of facts. Materialism is the auxiliary doctrine of every tyranny, whether of the one or of the masses. To crush what is spiritual, moral, human so to speak, in man, by specializing him; to form mere wheels of the great social machine, instead of perfect individuals; to make society and not conscience the center of life, to enslave the soul of things, to depersonalize man, this is the dominant drift of our epoch. Everywhere you may see a tendency to substitute the laws of dead matter (number, mass) for the laws of the moral nature (persuasion, adhesion, faith); equality, the principle of mediocrity, becoming a dogma; unity aimed at through uniformity; numbers doing duty for argument; negative liberty, which has no law *in itself,* and recognizes no limit except in force, everywhere taking the place of positive liberty, which means action guided by an inner law and curbed by a moral authority.

—AMIEL

THE POWER OF MERIT

THE true and ancient science of Psychology embraced a complete knowledge and use of all powers and functions of the inner man. So vast and mysterious are some of these that hardly a person of our day has done more than suspect the fact of their existence. So materialistic is our view that we refuse to admit the reality of any force or phenomenon that cannot be traced to the physical brain. Yet, every human being possesses such powers, either latent or active in degree. There is not a man but exercises daily some one or more of the highly occult forces of his inner self—unconsciously for the most part, and with no knowledge of how it is done. Nor will it ever be understood until the existence of the inner man is admitted, until the complete science and anatomy of soul is known.

One of the most miraculous powers of the inner self is that referred to by the ancients under the Sanskrit term, *Sacha Kiriya* and defined by H. P. Blavatsky as *the power of merit.* It is an occult and mysterious force in man resulting from the innate perception of having done what is right. It is the conscious or unconscious sense of knowing one's self to be allied with the universal Law of Justice—and with this knowing comes power. Where is the person, for example, who has not seen the courage and fearlessness of a pure and sinless man, or the cowardice of one smitten by his conscience? Who but has witnessed the strength and control of a person convinced of the justice of his cause? *Sacha Kiriya* is the dynamic power of righteous living. It springs from the spiritual part of man's nature and is more or less omnipotent, depending upon the faith and will-power of its possessor. How and why this is so finds explanation in the present day teachings of the Secret Doctrine.

Theosophy, like all great religions of the past, teaches that man is three-fold in his constitution, and that this three-fold nature corresponds to the triune nature of the universe. In the words of H.P.B.:

> Nature is triune: there is a visible, objective nature; an invisible, indwelling, energizing nature, the exact model of the other, and its vital principle; and, above these two, *spirit,* source of all forces,

> alone eternal, and indestructible. The lower two constantly change; the higher third does not.
>
> Man is also triune: he has his objective, physical body; his vitalizing astral body (or soul), the real man; and these two are brooded over and illuminated by the third—the sovereign, the immortal spirit. When the real man succeeds in merging himself with the latter, he becomes an immortal entity. (*Isis* II, 587-8.)

Spirit alone is the source of all forces, yet it is through the inner man or soul that these must flow. Except for soul, physical man on earth would be but empty mass, a senseless, powerless form. But the inner self does exist, whether we know it or not, and no amount of ignorance can alter the fact. Our ignorance or knowledge, however, can and does alter the flow of force from the spiritual to the physical, and herein lies the importance of intelligent care of soul.

Knowledge and virtue are as necessary to the soul as food and sunshine are to the body. How can a man who is careless of his physical health expect a strong and vigorous frame? How can one ignorant of the laws of soul hope to build a character that is fitted for the trials and tests of life? The sustenance we get through food comes not from the food itself, but from the ensouling essences of which the material particles are but physical plane representations. Physical food merely provides the contact: it puts the body in touch with the invisible, indwelling, energizing nature, through which the forces of Spirit may flow. The same is true with regard to sustenance gained from the sun. It is not the physical rays of the sun that are of greatest value to our inner and outer well-being, but its higher principles, the invisible hierarchy of intelligences that reside within and behind our solar orb. We benefit more or less from the sun, according to the way we think of it. It is the way we think of a thing that puts the forces in motion.

If man therefore finds himself to be ignorant or sinful or weak, it is because he has neglected, in one way or another, the necessary care of soul. He has unconsciously broken, perhaps, the currents of magnetic force that flow from his universal Self. If it is true, as stated in the *Ocean of Theosophy*, that the doubts of scientific scoffers at a seance can totally inhibit the psychic powers of the medium, what is the result of our own doubts and fears upon our-

selves? If suspicion, anger, and despondency have power to destroy the calm of the inner man, and by re-action to produce disease in the body, what do they do to the delicate fabrics of soul? We disrupt daily, by our uncontrolled thoughts and feelings, the life-giving forces of Spirit, and then complain when things go wrong. Man must eventually wake up to the fact that he is himself creator of all his ills, whether physical, psychic, or mental, must realize that if jealousy, doubt and distrust have power to cause disease, then the opposites of these can cure. "With expectancy supplemented by faith," says H. P. Blavatsky, "one can cure himself of almost any morbific condition." And Jesus tells his disciples that "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed . . . nothing shall be impossible unto you." Faith, confidence, and right motive work upon the subtle, tenuous threads of soul and construct a bridge between man on earth and his universal spiritual Self. Only among the virtuous are strength and courage to be found.

The evil or unjust man has no real and enduring power. He is able, it is true, to exercise a form of physical or psychic force, but it cannot last. It either ceases, or becomes self-destructive. The evil man never has the spirit to meet his fate with serenity. His ability to remain calm is equal only to his external show of bravado. By the mere fact of knowing in his heart that he is unjust, he severs his relation with Spirit, cuts himself off from the universal reservoir of force.

There is a tendency in our age to belittle the efficacy of righteous living. We think of strength and security only in terms of physical force, and laugh at the idea that there is power or protection in a spiritual position assumed. Not so with ancient psychologists. They held that the man who can look within himself and recount a life of noble deeds need have no fear of anything that heaven or earth may hold. He who can attest to the purity of his motive in all that he does—if not to his perfect wisdom—such a man has at his command, at least in degree, the power of *Sacha Kiriya,* the miraculous power of merit.

It is the aim of Theosophy to restore to man the science of true Psychology. It is not promised that the power to remove mountains can be his for the asking. It is not claimed that any inner force, however great or miraculous, can free a person from the due results

of past causation. But it does affirm that a spiritual position assumed, and action based on that position, will awaken in man the power and the Will to meet any trial that may come. It is what one thinks and feels and does in his heart and mind that either opens him up to the life-giving forces of Spirit or cuts him off from everything but those which in the end spell death.

DESIRE AND AVERSION

Remember that desire contains in it the profession (hope) of obtaining that which you desire; and the profession (hope) in aversion (turning from a thing) is that you will not fall into that which you attempt to avoid: and he who fails in his desire is unfortunate; and he who falls into that which he would avoid, is unhappy. If then you attempt to avoid only the things contrary to nature which are within your power, you will not be involved in any of the things which you would avoid. But if you attempt to avoid disease or death or poverty, you will be unhappy. Take away then aversion from all things which are not in our power, and transfer it to the things contrary to nature which are in our power. But destroy desire completely for the present. For if you desire anything which is not in our power, you must be unfortunate; but of the things in our power, and which it would be good to desire, nothing yet is before you. But employ only the power of moving toward an object and retiring from it; and these powers indeed only slightly and with exceptions and with remission. —EPICTETUS

INDIAN DAYS

A Dialogue of Life and Death: III

By H. P. Blavatsky

ALL this is very interesting," I said, "but it leads us away from the original object of our questions, which you seem reluctant to clear up for us, Thakur Sahib. It looks as if you were confirming and even encouraging the theories of the Babu. Remember that he says he disbelieves in the posthumous life, the life after death, and denies the possibility of any kind of consciousness exactly on the grounds of our not remembering anything of our past terrestrial life."

"I repeat again that the Babu is a Charvaka, who only repeats what he has been taught. It is not the system of the Materialists that I confirm and encourage, but the truth of the Babu's opinions in what concerns his personal state after death."

"Then do you mean to say that such people as the Babu are to be excepted from the general rule?"

"Not at all. Sleep is a general and unchangeable law for man as well as for every other terrestrial creature, but there are various kinds of sleep and still more various dreams."

"But it is not only the life after death and its dreams that he denies. He denies the immortal life altogether, as well as the immortality of his own spirit."

"In the first instance he acts according to the canons of modern European Science, founded on the experience of our five senses. In this he is guilty only with respect to those people who do not hold his opinions. In the second instance again he is perfectly right. Without the previous interior consciousness and the belief in the immortality of the soul, the soul cannot become Buddhi Taijasi. It will remain Manas*. But for Manas alone there is no immortality.

Note.—This concluding portion of "Indian Days" appeared in *The Theosophical Forum*, July, 1899.—Eds. Theosophy.

*Without the full assimilation with the Divine Soul, the terrestrial soul, or Manas, cannot live in eternity a conscious life. It will become Buddhi-Taijasi or Buddhi-Manas, only in case its general tendencies during its lifetime lead it towards the spiritual world. Then full of the essence and penetrated by the light of its Divine

In order to live a conscious life in the world on the other side of the grave, the man must have acquired belief in that world, in this terrestrial life. These are the two aphorisms of Occult Science, on which is constructed all our Philosophy in respect to posthumous consciousness and the immortality of the Soul. Sutratma gets only what it deserves. After the destruction of the body there begins for the Sutratma either a period of full awakening, or a chaotic sleep, or a sleep without reveries or dreams. Following your physiologists who found the causality of dreams in the unconscious preparation for them in the waking state, why should we not acknowledge the same with respect to posthumous dreams? I repeat what the Vedanta Sara teaches us: *Death is sleep.* After death there begins before our spiritual eyes a representation of a programme that was learned by heart by us in our lifetime, and sometimes even invented by us, the practical realization of our true beliefs, or of illusions created by ourselves. These are the posthumous fruit of the tree of life. Of course the belief or disbelief in the fact of conscious immortality cannot influence the unconditioned actuality of the fact itself, once it exists. But the belief or disbelief of separate personalities cannot but condition the influence of this fact in its effect on such personalities. Now I hope you understand."

"I begin to understand. The Materialists, disbelieving everything that cannot be controlled by their five senses and their so-called scientific reason and denying every spiritual phenomenon, point to the terrestrial as the only conscious existence. Accordingly they will get only what they have deserved. They will lose their personal I; they will sleep a sleep of unconsciousness until a new awakening. Have I understood rightly?"

"Nearly. You may add to that that the Vedantins, acknowledging two kinds of conscious existence, the terrestrial and the spiritual, point only to the latter as an undoubted reality. As to the terrestrial life, owing to its changeability and shortness, it is nothing but an illusion of our senses. Our life in the spiritual spheres must be considered a reality because it is there that lives

---

Soul, the Manas will disappear in Buddhi, will assimilate itself with Buddhi, still preserving a spiritual consciousness of its terrestrial personality; otherwise Manas, that is to say, the human mind, founded on the five physical senses, our terrestrial or our personal soul, will be plunged into a deep sleep without awakening, without dreams, without consciousness, till a new reincarnation.

our endless, never-changing immortal I, the Sutratma. Whereas in every new incarnation it clothes itself in a perfectly different personality, a temporary and short-lived one, in which everything except its spiritual prototype is doomed to complete destruction."

"But excuse me, Thakur. Is it possible that my personality, my terrestrial conscious I, could perish not only temporarily, as in the case of a Materialist, but still worse—leave no traces of itself whatever?"

"According to our teachings, not only is it to perish, but it *must* perish in all its completeness, except the one principle in it which, united to Buddhi, has become purely spiritual and now forms an inseparable whole. But in the case of a hardened Materialist it may happen that neither consciously nor unconsciously has anything of its personal I ever penetrated into Buddhi. The latter will not take away into eternity any atom of such a terrestrial personality. Your spiritual I is immortal, but from your present personality it will carry away only that which has deserved immortality, that is to say only the aroma of the flower mowed down by death."

"But the flower itself, the terrestrial I?"

"The flower itself, as all the past and future flowers which have blossomed and will blossom after them on the same mother branch, will become dust. Your real I is not, as you ought to know yourself, your body that now sits before me, nor your Manas, but your Sutratma-Buddhi."

"But this does not explain to me why you call our posthumous life immortal, endless, and real, and the terrestrial one a mere shadow. As far as I understand, according to your teaching, even our posthumous life has its limits, and though being longer than the terrestrial life, still has its end."

"Most decidedly. The spiritual Ego of the man moves in eternity like a pendulum between the hours of life and death, but if these hours, the periods of life terrestrial and life trans-sepulchral, are limited in their continuation, and even the very number of such breaks in eternity between sleep and waking, between illusion and reality, have their beginning as well as their end, the spiritual Pilgrim himself is eternal. Therefore the hours of his posthumous life, when unveiled he stands face to face with truth and the shortlived

mirages of his terrestrial existences are far from him, compose or make up, in our ideas, the only reality. Such breaks, in spite of the fact that they are finite, do double service to the Sutratma, which, perfecting itself constantly, follows without vacillation, though very slowly, the road leading to its last transformation, when, reaching its aim at last, it becomes a Divine Being. They not only contribute to the reaching of this goal, but without these finite breaks Sutratma-Buddhi could never reach it. Sutratma is the actor, and its numerous and different incarnations are the actor's parts. I suppose you would not call these parts, much less the costumes, the personality of the actor. Like an actor the soul is bound to play, during the cycle of births up to the very threshold of Paranirvana, many such parts, which are often disagreeable to it, but like a bee, collecting honey from every flower, and leaving the rest of the plant to feed the worms of the earth, our spiritual individuality, the Sutratma, collecting only the nectar of moral qualities and consciousness from every terrestrial personality in which it has to clothe itself, at last unites all these qualities in one, having then become a perfect being, a Dhyan Chohan. So much the worse for those terrestrial personalities from whom it could not gather anything. Of course, such personalities could not consciously outlive their terrestrial existence."

"Then the immortality of the terrestrial personality still remains an open question, and even immortality itself is not unconditioned?"

"By no means!" said the Master. "What I mean is that immortality could not be claimed for what has never had any existence; for everything that exists in Sat, or has its origin in Sat, immortality as well as infinity is unconditioned. Mulaprakriti is the reverse of Parabrahman, but they are both one and the same. The very essence of all this, that is to say, spirit, force and matter, have neither end nor beginning, but the shape acquired by this triple unity during its incarnations, their exterior so to speak, is nothing but a mere illusion of personal conceptions. This is why we call the posthumous life the only reality, and the terrestrial one, including the personality itself, only imaginary."

"Why in this case should we call the reality sleep, and the phantasm waking?"

"This comparison was made by me to facilitate your comprehension. From the standpoint of your terrestrial notions it is perfectly accurate."

"You say that posthumous life is founded on a basis of perfect justice, on the merited recompense for all the terrestrial sorrows. You say that Sutratma is sure to seize the smallest opportunity of using the spiritual qualities in each of its incarnations. Then how can you admit that the spiritual personality of our Babu, the personality of this boy, who is so ideally honest and noble-minded, so perfectly kind-hearted in spite of all his disbeliefs, will not reach immortality, and will perish like the dust of a dried flower?"

"Who, except himself," answered the Master, "ever doomed him to such a fate? I have known the Babu from the time he was a small boy, and I am perfectly sure that the harvest of the Sutratma in his case will be very abundant. Though his Atheism and Materialism are far from being feigned, still he *cannot* die for ever in the whole fulness of his individuality."

"But Thakur Sahib, did not you yourself confirm the rightness of his notions as to his personal state on the other side of the grave and do not these notions consist in his firm belief that after his death every trace of consciousness will disappear?"

"I confirmed them, and I confirm them again. When traveling in a railway train you may fall asleep and sleep all the time, while the train stops at many stations; but surely there will be a station where you will awake, and the aim of your journey will be reached in full consciousness. You say you are dissatisfied with my comparison of death to sleep, but remember, the most ordinary of mortals knows three different kinds of sleep—dreamless sleep, a sleep with vague chaotic dreams, and at last a sleep with dreams so very vivid and clear that for the time being they become a perfect reality for the sleeper. Why should not you admit an exact analogy in what happens to the soul freed from its body? After their parting there begins for the soul, according to its deserts, and chiefly to its faith, either a perfectly conscious life, a life of semi-consciousness, or a dreamless sleep which is equal to the state of non-being. This is the realization of the programme of which I spoke, a programme previously invented and prepared by the Materialist. But there are

Materialists and Materialists. A bad man, or simply a great egoist, who adds to his full disbelief a perfect indifference to his fellow beings, must unquestionably leave his personality for ever at the threshold of death. He has no means of linking himself to the Sutratma, and the connection between them is broken forever with his last sigh; but such Materialists as our Babu will sleep only one station. There will be a time when he will recognize himself in eternity, and will be sorry he lost a single day of the life eternal. I see your objections—I see you are going to say that hundreds and thousands of human lives, lived through by the Sutratma, correspond in our Vedantin notions to a perfect disappearance of every personality. This is my answer. Take a comparison of eternity with the single life of a man, which is composed of so many days, weeks, months, and years. If a man has preserved a good memory in his old age he may easily recall every important day or year of his past life, but even in case he has forgotten some of them, is not his personality one and the same through all his life? For the Ego every separate life is what every separate day is in the life of a man."

"Then, would it not be better to say that death is nothing but a birth for a new life, or, still better, a going back to eternity?"

"This is how it really is, and I have nothing to say against such a way of putting it. Only with our accepted views of material life the words 'live' and 'exist' are not applicable to the purely subjective condition after death; and were they employed in our Philosophy without a rigid definition of their meanings, the Vedantins would soon arrive at the ideas which are common in our times among the American Spiritualists, who preach about spirits marrying among themselves and with mortals. As amongst the true, not nominal Christians, so amongst the Vedantins—the life on the other side of the grave is the land where there are no tears, no sighs, where there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage, and where the just realize their full perfection."

YOUTH-COMPANIONS AT HOME

"I JUST don't know," Madge declared, putting down her cup and tilting back her chair until, wavering on two legs, it finally came to rest with a complaining squeak on the wall behind her. Mother looked up at her words, but winced at the sight of Madge and the chair suspended together in a state of unstable equilibrium.

"Oh, dear!" said Mother, with a little flutter in her voice. There were few things which could reduce Mother to a state of helplessness as quickly and completely as Madge's penchant for such precarious balancing acts. It wasn't that Mother was bound to convention, exactly, but, as she often pointed out, there must be some reason why chairs have always been made with four legs.

"What is it you just don't know?" she demanded, forcibly withdrawing her mind from Madge's actions and fixing it on her remark.

"Oh, stuffiness," replied Madge. "Detachment from the things of this world, self-righteousness, 'piety,' dogmas on how to live. How can people ever justify that with Theosophy?"

"And what, may I ask, brings this problem to your attention?"

"Well, maybe I'm giving too much importance to the thing," began Madge, a little deprecatingly, "but Marcia—the new girl, you know—came up to me the other night before the meeting, and after fumbling around for a bit, asked me point-blank if it was true that Theosophists didn't dance!" Madge paused to share a chuckle with Mother.

"And what did you say?"

"First of all I carefully explained that theosophists were *people,* and not automatic machines for generating the cardinal virtues, distilling the essence of brotherhood, devotion and self-sacrifice and inoculating the world with the result. I didn't use quite those words, of course, but she got the point. And I added, just to make sure, that while U.L.T. program throughout the year doesn't include social dancing in its activities, still there are some theosophists who do occasionally go dancing, and remarked that perhaps she'd like to come along with us next time we went. She said she'd like to, and that was that."

"It worked out all right, then, didn't it," said Mother, "and Marcia has the score straight?"

"It isn't *Marcia* I'm worried about," Madge rejoined, "but the somebody who told her that theosophists don't dance. I wonder why a person should talk so hard and fast about what theosophists do or don't do or ought to do? H.P.B. and W.Q.J. didn't."

"True, of course," agreed Mother. "But actually theosophists may not find themselves with a great deal of leisure time—perhaps that was what was intended, and Marcia misunderstood."

"Nothing like looking at the bright side, anyway," returned Madge, with an expression that far from matched her words. "But even so, I've heard remarks pretty much like that myself on occasion. It's almost as if some people feel that anything they *want* to do must be an 'impulse from the lower nature' and therefore reprehensible, if not downright vicious!" Madge paused for a moment.

"The question is," she went on, thoughtfully, "where do you draw the line between self-discipline and repression; between evaluating your own and others' acts—and self-righteousness? And why is it that when people try to detach themselves from the things they do and the conditions they're in, they sometimes end up more attached to them than ever—because they're so busy *avoiding* them?"

"Well, the weakness of self-righteousness, repression and the false detachment you mention is that they're negative," Mother replied.

"I suppose," Madge said musingly, "if people were really interested in the important things, there wouldn't be negative injunctions."

"Don't you think that's what the life of any sage makes clear?" Mother suggested. "One can judge the focus of his own thought by noting what he focusses on in others. If we are *bothered* by the self-righteousness of someone else, for instance, then we are indulging in a subtle form of the same thing. If we could just not be 'bothered' by what other people do, we wouldn't so often be drawn to imitate their faults."

"It would be interesting if we could see how many of our actions are simply *reactions,* you know?" said Madge. "That is, set to one side all the things we do just because they're done by someone we admire, and also the things we don't do because they're done by someone we *don't* admire, and then take a good look at what's left."

"—And that would be the sum of our own self-induced, self-devised, self-conscious actions," finished Mother. "It would probably make us re-think a little more often than we re-act, anyway!"

"But I still wish we had another word for detachment," Madge broke out. "Whenever you use the word, people think you mean some kind of an ivory-tower arrangement, or a quiet cell in a monastery, or a woodland retreat." She sniffed contemptuously.

"There's not much to being 'detached' from worldly things when you're completely detached from the *world* at the same time. Heavens! I'd be a perfect saint, in isolation!" she added.

"Possibly," said Mother, with a half-smile that adequately expressed her doubts. "People will often sidestep a habit rather than try to control it, at that. Like smoking, for instance. Your father has said many times that it's easier to cut it out than to cut it down. But he doesn't *get rid of* the habit—he periodically avoids it."

"It may be easier, but it wouldn't seem to get you very far," returned Madge, who had certain reservations—if not rationalizations—on this point. "After all, the only completely bad habit is the one you have no control over. And you certainly don't control it at all by running away from it. What if it should catch up with you some day—and it just as big as ever! Maybe that's what the Greeks meant by 'everything in moderation'."

"They meant 'nothing in excess,' I believe," Mother remarked mildly. "It's not that you have to go out and *do* everything, but that whatever you do should be reasonable and temperate. The real experience isn't a matter of the things you do, but of your purpose and self-control in doing them."

"Anyway," said Madge, whose train of thought hadn't slowed down yet, "the word detachment shouldn't be used to cover up timidity and selfish fears."

Mother nodded her agreement. "If you're afraid of involvement, you're not really detached at all. As long as we fear anything, we'll never be free from the lower nature. Detachment isn't separating ourselves from life, but neither is it identifying ourselves with any particular form of life or experience."

Madge looked thoughtful. "Well, it's maintaining a complete perspective, really, isn't it? " She pondered her definition for a moment, unconsciously leaning forward at the same time so that the chair resumed its normal position with what might be taken as a thud of complete approval. Mother, it is to be hoped, was holding on to whatever detachment she had. . . .

THE VOICE OF CONSCIENCE

For as the individual has voice, so has that in which the individual exists. Life itself has speech and is never Silent.—*Light on the Path*

VOX *populi vox Dei* characterized Ancient Rome at one stage of her history. It was a device which flattered the populace in the exercise of its suffrage on behalf of demagogy. When the need arises, it still serves a purpose in the politics of today. Notwithstanding its misuse, however, there is a sense in which the aphorism may be said to embody a truth—if we remove from its context the idea of a personal God. When most of us shall have perceived intuitionally that we are, if viewed altogether abstractly, "the vehicle of the manifested Avalokitesvara or Divine Atman (Spirit)," and also realize that "he who would profit by the wisdom of the universal mind, has to reach it through *the whole of Humanity* without distinction of race, complexion, religion, or social status," then, indeed, may Humanity hope to express in some measure the "Spiritual Soul." Until that day comes, we have to pay heed to such sense of right or wrong as we possess by virtue of the karmic heritage of mankind. Above all, we would do well to clarify our ideas on the subject of Conscience, its origins and derivatives, so that our lives may help others.

The Western world has had its own choice of theories with regard to the moral sense. With Plato, we may view the human soul as itself containing a non-rational and a rational element, and conceive that the proper relation between the two is the establishment of the higher and worthier factor as ruler over the inferior nature. In this scheme, the will is identified with intelligent choice, and both are assigned to the "reasoning" faculty *(nous)*. From this standpoint, allied with his doctrine of the non-empirical nature of truth in relation to pre-existence, arose Plato's deep conviction of the supreme importance of right conduct as an essential element in the acquirement of that knowledge which, freed from intellectual error, is "Virtue" in the highest sense. In violent contrast to this philosophical outlook, we have the dangerous dogma of the Atonement, a belief—

> which clashes not only with every conceivable view of justice and logic, but which, if analysed, leads man to his moral perdition,

> checks the progress of mankind, and positively making of might, right—transforms every second man into a Cain to his brother Abel. *(The Key to Theosophy.)*

Herein is to be seen the abrogation of conscience in all its aspects, verily, "a nightmare of the human intellect," as H. P. Blavatsky called this dogma. For, embedded in the teaching is the whole fallacy of a priesthood, and the belief in a fraudulent text in the Christian Gospels: "he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned" (*St. Mark,* XII, 16). All textual authority in religious scriptures which necessitates an official caste of priest-mediators, is a dark shadow upon the spiritual path which mankind must walk, if it is to follow the inner light of its own divinity. Indeed, in this field of an official channel of escape from damnation, we touch upon the psychic elements in the exoteric faiths of the world. In all these manifestations there is to be seen, not the steady illumination of a spiritual sense, but the flickering light of the *kamic* nature—an emotional assent to words emotionally propounded. As remarked by J. M. Robertson (*A Short History of Christianity,* 1931): "Emotions so evolved are of the surface, and are erased as easily as they are induced, by stronger emotions proceeding from the animal nature." The "anger" so often aroused by the exposition of the Law of Karma (and its corollary, Reincarnation) may be understood when the historical development of the religious consciousness is studied in this respect. One day, the unfettered conscience of Man will declare the ending of blind superstition, and will build its morality upon the rock of eternal truths instead of the shifting sands of human fancies.

Meanwhile, the natural reaction to a carnalized conception of salvation has set in, and, with the deadly criticism to which literalism in religious thinking has been subject, the idea of conscience itself has been degraded to a relationship with the technique of animism. That *conditio sine qua non* of materialistic thought—primitive man—is brought into evidence, and is made to display his prowess as the prime originator of all subsequent culture and civilization! Dr. Sigmund Freud solemnly told us in his *Totem and Taboo* (1919) that "Taboo conscience is probably the oldest form in which we meet the phenomenon of conscience," and that conscience is probably conditioned by both taboo (a Polynesian word meaning "holy dread") and what modern psychology calls "the

compulsion neurosis." Unfortunately, the arch-priest of psychoanalysis is unable to help us with regard to the possibility of a state of innocency. Referring to taboo as a command, he mentions that the violation of it "causes a terrible sense of guilt which is as self-evident as its origin is unknown." This fact has not handicapped the efforts made by this school to paralyze the moral sense by freeing "the libido"—which seems to be *kama* under a new guise.

There is a view of Conscience which looks upon it as very much of a personal acquisition, "the granary of all experiences in other lives," and regards its influence as exhibiting the most potent effects of memory. There is absent here, in a string of memories unimmersed in the alembic of the spiritual consciousness, that objectivity without which, as Ed. von Hartmann remarked, there is no morality. Such a conscience obviously would be without one of its most important features—universal validity, based upon the spiritual unity of living beings. It is not far removed from the opinion which regards knowledge as derived from sensation, and the personal idea of right and wrong from the same source. If we are to think of moral judgments as simply feelings or emotions of a particular kind (whether or not the fruit of unitary experience), we are thrown back upon our likes or dislikes as the measure of conduct, and, in the long run, are tempted to follow the line of least resistance, in the spirit of Hume's famous saying: "Actions are not approved because they are moral: they are moral because they are approved." Even if we go beyond feelings and accept the findings of the anthropological school as to the concept of Duty superseding, in the course of evolution, the association of instinctive ideas (by which "primitives" are supposed to profit by their simple experiences), we are still anchored to the physical brain and its development as explanation of the moral sense. Haeckel indicated the source of the truncated view of human nature in his *Pedigree of Man* (quoted in *The Secret Doctrine* II, 651-2):

> Now the central point of Darwin's teaching lies in this, that it demonstrates the simplest mechanical causes, purely physico-chemical phenomena of nature, as wholly sufficient to explain the highest and most difficult problems.

In that direction we seek in vain for the answer to the existence of a compelling conscience, which, even in ordinary philosophical

terms, not merely indicates what we ought to do, but also impels us to do the right or prevents us from acting wrongly.

There is evidence enough to show the need, especially in a transition age, of a firmly rooted philosophy as a base for the growth of a sound morality, having an undisputed conscience, the voice of the real Self of man, as its indefeasible mentor. A faculty of cognition is required—a channel through which divine knowledge, which is also divine conscience, the discernment of good and evil, may reach the Ego. Such an instrument of ethical knowledge is *Chiti,* "as a quality of Manas in conjunction with Buddhi," the vehicle of Atma. Of *Chiti* we are told that it is the quality "by which the effects and consequences of actions and kinds of knowledge are selected for the use of the soul or conscience, the *inner* Voice in man" (*S.D.* I, 288 fn). Here is the esoteric version of that "reasoning" faculty to which Plato refers in his exposition of Virtue. Wedded to Buddhi, it transforms conscience into "that instantaneous perception between right and wrong" whose promptings are a direct light from the shining Augoeides, illuminating all judgments:

> Cosmic ideation focussed in a principle or *upadhi* (basis) results as the consciousness of the individual Ego. Its manifestation varies with the degree of *upadhi,* e.g. through that known as *Manas* it wells up as Mind-Consciousness; through the more finely differentiated fabric (sixth state of matter) of the *Buddhi* resting on the experience of Manas as its basis—as a stream of spiritual INTUITION (*S.D.* I, 329 fn).

Among Western philosophers, Immanuel Kant reflected the ancient teaching with his categorical imperative—"a command the obligation of which is not conditional upon any subjective wish or inclination on the part of the individual whose reason recognizes the obligation." (This was contrasted by Kant with what he called a Hypothetical Imperative, a command to do a certain act on a condition, *i.e.,* as a means to some end, happiness, perfection, etc.—see *Ethics,* by Hastings Rashdall.) Both Eastern and Western thought meet in this ground of principle, and the counsel of the Buddha becomes fraught with the utmost significance:

> Betake yourselves to no external refuge. Hold fast to the truth as a lamp. Hold fast as a refuge to the truth. Look not for a refuge to anyone besides yourselves.

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS

On Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms

APHORISM *21 (Book III): The note on this Aphorism speaks of luminousness as the manifestation of* SATTVA, *while the eye is also a manifestation of* SATTVA *in another aspect. Now, according to the* GLOSSARY, *Sattva is goodness, or purity—one of the three divisions of nature—and it is difficult to see the connection between the quality of goodness in nature and such an objective quality as luminousness, while the human eye is even more objective. Please explain.*

It is necessary for the theosophical student to return in this instance, as in so many others, to some of the fundamental clarifications made by H. P. Blavatsky in the *Secret Doctrine.* Spirit and matter, she states, are *not* two realities but *two aspects* of the same reality. Similarly, the quality of *tamas* or inertia is not a description of matter, but rather the description of a certain aspect of matter—more clearly, spirit-intelligence *temporarily* represented as matter and exhibiting one characteristic predominantly. So with *sattva,* there is not "a certain proportion" of matter, out of which human eyes are constructed, which is "Sattvic." Spirit-matter, in a certain condition, produces an aspect able to exhibit the unique qualities of luminousness.

It is not difficult to see why "goodness" and "luminousness" are both associated with Sattva, since one is the most highly perceptive state viewed from the standpoint of the soul, and the other is the most perceptive state afforded by conditions of matter.

Aphorism 22: I can understand how a power over oneself, one's own organs and functions, is lawful, but it does not seem lawful to use such power over others. Nor, in Aphorism 24, can I understand there to be any wisdom in being able to acquire the friendship of whomsoever one may desire. How can one want a friendship that is not mutually desirable? I hold the same reserve with regard to Aphorism 35.

It may first be noted that such powers are described as being held *only* over the five physical senses. This is not, for instance, a power to interfere with the egoic discriminative faculties. Rather its exercise might be used in order to avoid the *distraction* of per-

ceptive intelligence by sensory impressions, so that the perception itself might become clear. It is common human experience to have one's most dispassionate discriminative faculties hindered by the intrusion of sights, sounds, and odors. The ascetic of pure mind would, by his own superior powers of concentration, be able to inspire continued attention of others upon soul realities—oblivious of external intrusions. And this possibly to such a degree that awareness of objects of sense would disappear altogether.

To have the power of acquiring "a friendship of whomsoever he may desire" does not mean that the devotee of yoga is able to create a "friendship" that is *not mutually* desirable. Rather, the powers of the yogi simply make his friendship discernible and desirable to others. This may be done by projecting enough of the yogi's essential feeling and quality of character to demonstrate the levels of real communication which exist, even if usually hidden, between any two souls. Aphorism 35 does not suggest that the yogi *judges* the "mental conditions, purposes, and thoughts of others" but simply that he is able to see them clearly. This is not a special faculty to be developed apart from growth in general discrimination. It is simply the inevitable outcome of understanding one's own nature thoroughly—which, before its completion, does involve such specific matters as awareness of the condition of all the nervous centers of the body. The word "heart" may symbolize both the qualities of soul and the nature of a specific psycho-physical condition in the nervous system. Though the words and approach are entirely different, this would indicate a knowledge of what is now called psycho-biology, common enough in Patanjali's time, but built upon a more solid philosophical foundation than that supplied by the orthodox assumptions of contemporary materialism.

Aphorisms 30-33: Is not this type of concentration dangerous for the Westerner, or for anyone, without the guru's direction and protection? The worst danger seems indicated in Aphorism 52, as a corollary of Aphorism 33.

This type of concentration would not be "dangerous for the Westerner" if all the preliminary steps of training assumed by Patanjali had been taken in proper fashion. However, an almost unsolvable difficulty lies in the fact that the whole psychic environment of our latter "Iron Age" militates against knowledge and

control of occult forces and powers. The conditions under which the equivalent of Patanjali's "Guru assistance" might exist today would obviously be extremely difficult to obtain. The freakish psychic involvements of many theosophists in the periods of Theosophical-Society-confusion which followed the deaths of H. P. Blavatsky and W. Q. Judge do indicate that certain forms of insanity may be contracted through exercising the desire to establish *personal* communication with "higher entities." The most amusing as well as the most tragic illustration of this is to be found in the cases of C. W. Leadbeater and Mrs. Besant, who gave out interviews with the Manu and Solar Logos. There are many ways in which undisciplined psychics may suffer "a renewal of afflictions of the mind," as indicated in Aphorism 52. The legends of occultism contain mysterious references to the "star rishis," elementals apparently charged with sufficient sensual power to confuse the psychic and the biological natures of those who trespass with questionable motives upon realms presently beyond normal ability to control.

How does the practice shown in Aphorism 34 differ essentially from "New Thought" practices? According to that cult, if, for instance, you desire money—concentrate on getting it, and you will get it.

The essential difference between the practices suggested by Aphorism 34 and those of "New Thought" is that Patanjali describes concentration upon a desired *understanding,* whereas "New Thought" involves concentration upon a physical consummation of wish-fulfillment. There is not, however, an "essential difference" between "New Thought" procedures and the habits of *Hatha* Yoga. This for the reason that in neither instance is there a primary concern with understanding. Those who separated the schools of Hatha Yoga from Raja Yoga in Patanjali's time—and this was done then as well as during later periods of great philosophical corruption in Eastern lands—were divorcing the Science of Ends from the Science of Means. The whole karma of Western culture is a crude and awful reflection of the same psychological tendency.

The desire for *knowledge* is always pure, and the Means undertaken, if this End be genuinely in view, will not corrupt the practitioner. Aphorism 34, in its suggestion that after long practice the

ascetic can "disregard the various aids to concentration hereinbefore recommended," is another indication that Patanjali's whole emphasis was upon knowledge or understanding. The greatest teachers and instructors are never primarily concerned with the specific results which may be attained by a pupil; they are rather themselves concentrated upon aiding the student to understand the basic *principles* and *theories* of their science. This will be found to hold true even today in the meticulous disciplines of the physical sciences. "New Thought" practices are like irresponsible scientific experimentation; they produce results, but those results confuse, rather than improve the processes of thought.

Eastern and Western Occultism

How is it that H.P.B. so severely criticizes the Western systems of Occultism and yet admits in some of her writings that they lead to the same end as the Eastern system?

W.Q.J.—It is very true that all systems of Occultism lead to the same end, since all must be based on similar principles, however distorted some may be in practice, but the road by one will be more difficult than by another until the real highway of Universal Occultism is reached. It was thought by H.P.B. that true Eastern Occultism was the primeval system and hence better than the Western. For the Western is all overgrown with the weeds sown by Judaism in the beginning and mediaeval Christianity in the end. So it will be found that although at bottom Western Occultism has the same doctrines as the Eastern, a vast mass of rubbish has to be carried off in order to get at the truth. Any one who will dive into Rosicrucianism will find those difficulties. It must always be borne in mind, too, that H.P.B. in speaking of Eastern Occultism had in view the real thing and not the many systems in India which would juggle the student quite as much as the things in the Western schools.

Speaking for my own beliefs, I do not think Western Occultism is worthy of the name and is only a hodge-podge that produces confusion when the mere outer crust of virtuous living is mastered. It leads to saintliness but not to that higher knowledge which must be added to the good in order to make them also the wise.

—*The Vahan,* June 15, 1891

ON THE LOOKOUT

God's New Publicity Campaign

Under the title, "Science—A Mystery Story," *Life's* editorial for June 23 increases the tempo of that magazine's efforts to reinstate "God" in the popular consciousness. The editorial sub-title, "The more man studies nature, the more reasons he finds for believing in God," is the crux of the thesis. The method of presenting this argument, however, may legitimately be subjected to the same condemnations as were accorded the efforts of Nazi propagandists to instill a "race" myth. The first paragraph states that "scientists are losing their confidence in science as a sufficient guide to life and are turning more and more to various kinds of religion." From this erroneous introductory passage (many scientists *do* feel that present science is woefully incomplete, but seldom do they embrace any variety of Christianity to fill the gaps), the *Life* editor accomplishes a rapid transition to mention of such well-known names as A. H. Compton and J. B. S. Haldane, introducing their contradictory quotations to illustrate the contention that "scientists can never agree." Thus the stage is set for the smug editorial remark that to many scientists "one feels like saying, 'if you want to know about God why not study theology?—that is a science too'." Later, the editorial asserts that "belief in God is the only source of values man is sure of."

Perversion of Meaning

It is one thing to assert a personal belief "in God"—a poor enough opinion, perhaps, from the standpoint of Theosophical education in self-reliance—but it is far more culpable to mislead the public as to the opinions of responsible psychologists and men of science. The last column of the editorial cites a phrase of psychologist Carl Jung's in substantiation of *Life's* implicit dogma that we need to "believe in God." Jung said simply that no sociological data can "sustain the notion of human brotherhood," the latter idea requiring instead "truth about the world" for its support. *Life's* editors have completed the statement themselves in this fashion: "It requires 'a truth about the world'—*i.e., an idea of God—to do that*" (italics ours).

It is impossible to "prove" anything by history, but it is prudent in this instance to recall that no highly organized institution, such as the Luce publications, has ever praised God in any such fashion abstractly; such appeals are always appeals to return to The Church. It would be hard to believe that mere coincidence is responsible for the correlation between *Life's* special pleading for religion and the spectacular conversion to Catholicism of Clare Boothe Luce, wife of *Life's* publisher (See THEOSOPHY XXXV, 432). Without taking time to review the thesis of Harold Fey's "Can Catholicism Win America?" (See Lookout XXXIII, 191), and without making definite charges that *Life's* editorial is carefully concealed Catholic propaganda, it can be stated on prime facie evidence that *Life* has now recapitulated the essence of the worst crimes practiced by the Jesuit orders in times past—the distortion of evidence to the public. The betrayal of the common man by the intellectuals—and *Life's* editors are intellectuals in every modern sense of the word—stands at the top of the list of man's inhumanities to man.

CONFUSING THESES BY MODERN SCIENTISTS

It is quite true that the scientists mentioned by *Life* have indicated their personal discomfiture with simple materialism. But it should be noted that the majority of these—Morrison, Millikan, Mather and Compton—are advanced in years and have been long known as upholders of a theological point of view. Shroedinger, as Philip Wylie points out in a letter taking issue with the questionable editorial, does not refer to God in the theological sense at all—any more than Jung refers to "religion" as *Life's* editors would like the public to believe he did. Leading physicists, mathematicians, and biologists often give evidence that they are seeking new light in unresolved mysteries, but they endeavor, in the majority of cases, to retain scientific impartiality—a feat which they apparently realize bars them from any traffic with theology, per se. As men of integrity, they refuse to over-simplify the task or to assert the possession of knowledge until they can speak with personal confidence of a theory developed to fit facts rather than "God's world." Some scientific observations, also, are simply the result of a common-sense perception that technological advancement—including and especially atom splitting—is not especially "progress" in bettering human relations.

A Historian's Wanderings

The *Time-Life* combination has not missed a fruitful opportunity to exploit the recent highly publicized works of Arnold J. Toynbee. Historian Toynbee is now laboring to finish production on an immense ten-volume essay entitled *A Study of History. Time* (March 17) identifies a trend toward God as one of Toynbee's major contributions to the theories of history:

> Toynbee shattered the frozen patterns of historical determinism and materialism by again asserting God as an active force in history. His assertion, implicit throughout the 3,488 pages of *A Study of History,* implied another: the goal of history, however dimly sensed in human terms, is the Kingdom of God. That aspiration redeems history from being a futile tragedy of blood.

Here again, these popular editorializers are guilty of special interpretation and perversion. Mr. Toynbee refers to God in a symbolical sense and is not pleased with the rigidities of sectarian religion. He does not like St. Augustine, Aristotle, and Ignatius Loyola—a negative judgment which removes him many leagues from the terrain of belief so industriously harrowed by *Time* and *Life.*

Toynbee is convinced that civilization is not making any progress in co-operation despite "improvement" in external standards. Therefore he points out that the only escape from destruction will lie in a turning within, to religion. As one reviewer, Granville Hicks, remarked (February *Harper's*) "though his [Toynbee's] faith in religion is strong there is no organized religious body that can take comfort from his words." But it *is* possible for organized religious bodies to exploit Toynbee's mention of "God" and Christ, as *propaganda* for their respective sects. Toynbee actually uses the word God very loosely, chiefly as a symbol of universal spiritual intelligence, and he is probably not endeavoring to lead the public in a specific direction. In the normal course of events his works would be read principally by historians sufficiently impartial to understand his use of terms. But Toynbee's few remarks on the subject of religion are selected and abstracted by religious opportunists, particularly intellectual Catholics, for biassed presentation to the public. It is extremely difficult to combat such an "underground campaign." It bears all the earmarks of respectability and seldom shows its hand as clearly as in the case of *Life's* June 23 editorial.

A Materialist Preferred?

In a letter printed by *Life* on July 14, Philip Wylie castigates this use of *Life's* editorial page, and points out the dangers of the "back to religion" trend. The reply is worth reading as illustrative of the genuine concern which has inspired many of Mr. Wylie's castigations of a false church-culture. Mr. Wylie himself, however, vigorously asserts that man, while not God's creature, is still a creature. (See Lookout for July.) It is nevertheless possible to see the difference in the cleavage of opinion existing between Wylie's viewpoint and that of theosophical students, and the cleavage between the theosophist and the apologist for *Life's* "God." With Mr. Wylie, there is chiefly a philosophical score to be settled with all major premises above board. *Life* and *Time,* however, with a clever arrangement of cliches, impose a moralistic deception on their readers. There is no greater misuse than this of the power of the press.

God Enters Politics

The more influential God becomes, the more is he sought as an ally of political opinions. The New York *Times* (May 4) carried a very interesting portrayal of God's strength—and upon what side He throws His weight. A full page advertisement purchased by the General Tire and Rubber Company of Akron, Ohio, invited the American public to pay attention to a radio program entitled "The Greatest Story Ever Told"—apparently a dramatic re-do of the old theme, "God's way is the American Way." This program, according to the General T & R Company—

> draws upon incidents in the Bible to refresh people's minds about the most radical doctrine ever preached.
>
> *It could not be broadcast in Russia.*
>
> It would disturb the Russian worker to know that man is not the tool of the state—to be enslaved and denied the fruits of his labor; to be disenfranchised, displaced, interned or liquidated by political whim. It would disillusion him to know that there is a government under which, by simply having faith in God and a decent respect for one another's rights, as members of His family, he can live more happily than by giving in to despair of Him and hate for one another. . . .
>
> It reminds us that without faith men have no moral yardstick by which to judge the motives of their leaders. The most powerful

man of the hour is God, accountable to no one, not even his own conscience.

Inspiration for an Advertisement

This particular use of God as nationalist-spirited citizen has an obvious psychological origin. An American business organization, actuated by fear of "communism," sets out to prepare for the destruction of the object of its fear. If it were honest, its public declaration would say, "We are afraid. We will fight." When the words are, instead, "We are God's people; He is against communism; let us fight God's war"—that is devious propaganda.

As the last sentence of the General T & R Company essay reveals, God is the ideal fascist. He knows He is right, just as does the General T & R Company, and because He is right He is accountable to no one, "not even to his own conscience." It is precisely because a belief in God never remains a matter of theological opinion, but instead insists upon thrusting its influence into political and economic mores, that the "god idea" is given so much consideration in the pages of Lookout. "God," *materialized* from a concept of abstract spirit as he is, *will always be portrayed* as the holder of institutionalized opinions.

What Kind of Religion?

The faith in God evoked by the efforts of *Time-Life* Inc., will immediately be put to work by appropriate agencies to bolster the strength of organized religion. More and more will taxpayers' funds be considered the legitimate prey of sectarian institutions. Easier and easier will it be to convince the average American that a war with Russia—if there be one—is so much "God's war" that the slightest question of such fact would become sacrilegious—and all of this, perhaps, with little direct mention of the word "God." Not the word, but the psychology unconsciously engendered by its use, is the primary danger.

Has the American nation a religious basis? Easily, under the General T & R definition of the Godhood: *any* policy is godlike for "the most powerful [nation] of the hour," if, like God, that nation is "accountable to no one, not even to his own conscience!" Evidently the tire competitors, like other segments of human nature,

solace themselves with the notion that their words will cover their deeds, and that "The Greatest Story Ever Told" will redound to their (commercial) credit.

"The Hucksters"

Frederic Wakeman's *The Hucksters* is a new "debunking" novel, now reaching the large non-reading portion of our population through the medium of a motion picture bearing the same title. Corresponding, so far as their drive for realism is concerned, to the works of such writers as John Dos Passos following World War I, Wakeman's novels portray the sophisticated aimlessness of a world which knows that everything is advertised and all advertising is sham, yet fails to indulge any real hope for a better world. *The Hucksters* illustrates the total decadence of advertising, least excusable of all American industries. The motion picture version, undoubtedly at the insistence of the American Association of Manufacturers, runs in a few lines about how different it would be were the hero to find a product he "really believes in," but the very appearance of both book and motion picture indicate that total disillusionment is now popular. Can there be a psychological correlation between the insincerity of misleading advertising and the many centuries during which "God" was used to advertise some institutional or nationalist product? From the standpoint of the Theosophical philosophy it can clearly be seen that adverse cultural habits never disappear until their original psychological causes are understood. Instead they multiply in wondrously diverse manners.

The Mediums of Advertising

Once persons—or churches—reach conviction in respect to their *own* propaganda they are on the road to becoming partial psychological mediums—able to believe anything and willing to sell anything. Just as the seances of the last century were responsible for many incitements to fraud, so is the warped psychology of the Western civilization—more than any group of individuals—responsible for the misleading content of most advertising propaganda. One typical illustration of the manner in which the "mediums" and "controls" of advertising can practice fraud upon the public may be listed as an example of the psychology of misrepresentation: *The*

Rural New Yorker of March 15 contained the first of a series of three articles on "Why Milk Pasteurization?" collecting facts to refute misleading financially-inspired arguments for pasteurized milk. The articles specifically analyzed were:

> "How Safe Is Your Town's Milk?" by Holman Harvey, *The Reader's Digest,* August, 1946; which in turn was condensed from Mr. Harvey's article in *The Progressive* (Madison, Wis.), July 15, 1946; "Raw Milk Can Kill You," by Harold J. Harris, M.D., in *Coronet,* May, 1945; and "Undulant Fever," by Milton Mackaye, in *Ladies' Home Journal,* December, 1944.

Included in the propaganda circulated by these national periodicals are a typhoid fever epidemic in Montreal, allegedly traced to a raw milk dairy, but actually and officially found to originate in a pasteurizing dairy; and an undulant fever epidemic concocted for the *Coronet* article, even though—as the writer stated before and after publication—he knew that such a thing could not possibly happen the way he had described it. A decided declaration is quoted from Dr. J. Howard Brown of Johns Hopkins University:

> The public has been bombarded with sensational articles in popular magazines creating the impression that anyone who drinks a glass of raw milk is in imminent danger of contracting undulant fever and that if all milk were pasteurized there would be no human brucellosis. Neither proposition is true.

"A STEP BACKWARD"

The Rural New Yorker continues:

> Contrary to current popular belief, pasteurization of milk is not a step forward in nutrition and health. It is a step backward. Certain important nutritional elements, *i.e.,* vitamins, enzymes and minerals, are lost; low standards of milk production are encouraged; incentive for high grade milk production is discouraged; competition in distribution is narrowed; monopoly control of producers is made possible; and the dietary value of the milk is lowered, while the cost to the consumer is increased.

The suggestion of a money motive behind pasteurization propaganda explains why it has deviated from the facts and educated the public in falsehoods and fear. Large untruths were once propagandized—via definition of God—in the interests of securing power. Advertising simply carries on the same tradition in a smaller way for profit.

A "Child" Debased

The effect of devious advertising is nowhere more evident than in the history of radio. What might have been a powerful instrument for the general welfare has been absorbed and abused for commercial gain, and richly deserved the parental rebuke administered by Lee de Forest, 73, who fathered modern radio with his 1907 invention of the audion tube. On the 40th anniversary of the National Association of Broadcasters, de Forest wrote:

> "What have you gentlemen done with my child? He was conceived as a potent instrumentality for culture, fine music, the uplifting of America's mass intelligence. You have debased this child, you have sent him out on the streets . . . to collect money from all and sundry. . . .
>
> "You have made him a laughing stock of intelligence, surely a stench in the nostrils of the gods of the ionosphere; you have cut time into tiny cublets . . . wherewith the occasional fine program is periodically smeared with impudent insistence to buy or try.
>
> "The nation has no soap, but soap opera without end or sense floods each household daily.
>
> "Murder mysteries rule the waves by night and children are rendered psychopathic by your bedtime stories.
>
> "This child of mine has been resolutely kept to the average intelligence of thirteen years . . . as though you and your sponsors believe the majority of listeners have only moron minds. Nay, the curse of his commercials has grown consistently more cursed, year by year." (*Time,* Feb. 10.)

"The Administrator"

A recent lecture by Robert M. Hutchins in the University of Chicago series, "The Works of the Mind," brings a lucid application of Platonic principle to the field of educational administration. Originally published in the *Journal of Higher Education* for November, 1946, and now reprinted on request by the *Journal,* this lecture deserves careful study by the Theosophical student. Here Dr. Hutchins is no longer striving to popularize the "imponderables of metaphysics" in the inadequate language of contemporary scholasticism, but deals in simple terms with the facts of the administrative dilemna in which he himself has for so long existed.

The meaning of Hutchins' frequently repeated remark that "only a revolution will save us" is given tangible illustration in his com-

ments. He requires that educators either retire or recognize that they must travel in a hurry toward clarification of the Educational Goal, without fear of the criticisms to which all pioneers are inevitably subjected. He writes:

> As it is easy and tempting to become an officeholder rather than an administrator, so it is easy and tempting not to think about the end. As everybody in the institution prefers an officeholder to an administrator, so everybody in the institution prefers not to be reminded that the university has, or should have, a purpose. The worst kind of troublemaker is the man who insists upon asking about first principles, and the first principle of any activity is the end. The last question that will be raised about a prospective academic administrator is whether he has any ideas. If it appears that he has, he is unlikely to be appointed, for he will rightly be regarded as a dangerous man. The situation in American education is much the same as that in American politics.

Another Educational Reformer

Hutchins' pungent criticisms of the typical university officeholder are obviously not penned with a desire to establish a reputation for cleverness at the expense of a scapegoat. He is simply trying to educate: "We can take one of two positions about education today. Either it aims to transform the minds and hearts of men, or it is completely irrelevant." His use of Plato is particularly apt:

> Plato was writing a utopia. Utopias are the products of desperate situations. They are constructed when everybody sees that nothing can be done, except perhaps to indicate the ideals toward which future generations should strive. We look to Plato not for the specifications of a practical program to be taken over intact, but for guidance in the formation by our own efforts of a practical program for our own day.

Plato's conclusion from Book V of *The Republic* is quoted:

> Unless either philosophers become kings or those whom we now call our kings and rulers take to the pursuit of philosophy seriously and adequately, and there is a conjunction of these two things, political power and philosophic intelligence, there can be no cessation of troubles, dear Glaucon, for our states, nor, I fancy, for the human race either.

Peculiar Qualifications

Hutchins' strongly critical remarks had ample provocation in his own experience. He relates:

> The chairman of the committee of the trustees to select a president for an important college on the Atlantic seaboard telephoned me the other day to inquire about one of my friends. He asked whether he was a good administrator. In my innocence, thinking he wanted a good administrator as president of his college, I entered upon a glowing description of my friend's administrative abilities. I found that my tribute was received without enthusiasm at the other end of the wire, and asked if I had misunderstood the question. "No," replied the trustee. "You understood the question all right. But you are giving the wrong answer. You see, our retiring president was a very bad administrator. Our faculty likes that, and they are afraid of any successor who will be better."

The Mob and the Leader

In contrast to this corrupting cynicism, Dr. Hutchins states his own view of the duties of an educational administrator:

> The administrator fails in his duty . . . if he does not try to see from his point of vantage what the whole curriculum and its interrelations should be.
>
> He must then try to induce those to whose care the curriculum has been committed to face the problems it raises as persistently, as seriously, and as impartially as possible. In this connection, too, the administrator must be a troublemaker; for every change in education is a change in the habits of some members of the faculty. . . .
>
> Men who possess and practice the virtues are rare enough. Good men who are also good philosophers are rarer still. Good men who are good philosophers and who are willing to run the extraordinary occupational hazards, moral and mental, of university administration are a race which appears to be extinct. Yet if I were asked what single thing American education needed most, I should reply that it needed such men; for the whole system of American education is losing itself in the wilderness for the lack of them. The academic administrators of America remind one of the French revolutionist who said, "The mob is in the street. I must find out where they are going, for I am their leader."

Burn Them Down?

It has taken the professors and college presidents of America a long time to realize that Hutchins' remarks are never simply playful. His bold revisions of "accepted" university practice have

demonstrated that there is more than rhetoric in his approval o the suggestion that universities—

> should be burned down every twenty-five years, or . . . the original faculty should consist of men forty years old, that no additions should be made, and that they should all retire at the age of sixty-five. These proposals seem drastic, but they are little more so than the facts demand. It is imperative to force the periodic re-consideration of the purpose of an institution. . . .
>
> The end of an institution gets lost as it matures. The enterprise goes on because it started and runs for the sake of running. If any other consideration than that of self-perpetuation is allowed to enter, it is usually that of prestige. Let us be famous for the sake of fame. We see a similar phenomenon in the case of states which have lost any conception of the end of political organization. They say, let us be powerful for the sake of power.

The Mood of Resignation

Hutchins sees the administrator as primarily a man of mora responsibility. Administration, he writes, is chiefly a strain upo character:

> The strain on the character is very great. The administrator who is afraid of anybody or anything is lost. The administrator who cannot stand criticism, including slander and libel, is lost. . . . Failing some provision for the automatic termination of his services, the administrator must be in a perpetual mood of resignation, by which I do not mean mournful acceptance of the universe. I mean he must be perpetually prepared to get out.

As Hutchins himself suggests, the problems raised in this ar ticle are not limited to educational institutions alone. They ar the problems of government, the problems of labor unions, th problems of economics, and the problems of Theosophical educatior Every genuine teacher becomes an "administrator" the moment h counsels or takes part in any form of social action. If he is man of principle he must become a revolutionary, and since revolutionary is trying to win something, he must undertake the up hill struggle of marshalling the forces which may be induced to serv under his flag. Yet at the same time, he must be enough of "philosopher king" to be personally indifferent to his own succes or failure.